



Frequently Asked Questions on Manhaj : Part 13

Introduction

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

This is a summarisation of some of the issues of manhaj that have been subject to contention in the current times. The detailed answers and proofs on all the issues addressed in this series can be found on the articles at Wwww.SalafiPublications.Com that are related to these matters. This series is aimed at quickly identifying the issues in a brief, yet concise manner, for the benefit of those who may be unaware of these affairs.

Question 17. There are some doubts that the Qutubiyyah and those affected by this manhaj use in order to justify khurooj (rebellion).

Yes. Amongst the greatest of characteristics that single out the Qutubiyyah, the Kharijites, and those affected or poisoned by their doctrines is their calls for rebellions and violence as the only way for the establishment of the Islamic authority. And they use numerous doubts to this end, and which shall be answered by the people of knowledge in what follows below:

Doubt 1: Khurooj is required without needing to look at the state of weakness

This was answered by Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen who said: "And there is a doubt (shubhah) with many of the youth, which has become firmly and deeply rooted in their minds and it has kindled the issue of revolting against the rulers - and it is: that those rulers replace the Sharee'ah (haa'ulaa il-Hukkaam mubaddiloon), they prescribe the (secular) laws from themselves and they do not rule by what Allaah has revealed and the rule is present - but they prescribed laws from themselves. So (these youth) judged them with apostasy and disbelief and then they built upon this that so long as those rulers are disbeliever it is necessary to kill them, and does not matter that we are in a state of weakness. Because (not fighting) in the state of weakness was abrogated by the verses of the sword (permitting fighting), therefore there is no place for acting (as if we were) in the state of weakness - as they say - that state that the Muslims in Makkah were in!

So the answer to this doubt is that we say: "There is no escaping from that we know firstly: Does the description of apostasy apply to them or not? And this requires knowing the evidences which indicate that this saying or action is apostasy, then applying them to an individual, and then, whether this individual has any doubts (which may excuse him) or

not? Meaning: Sometimes a text can indicate that this action is kufr and this saying is kufr, but there are preventive barriers which prevent the application of the ruling of kufr upon this specific individual.

And these preventive barriers are many, amongst them dhann (speculation) which is ignorance and amongst them ghalabah (which means being overcome by something).

So the man who said to his family, "When I die burn me and scatter my ashes in the sea because if Allaah grasps me He will punish me with a punishment that He has never inflicted upon anyone in the world". The apparent belief of this man is kufr and doubt in the power of Allaah. However, when Allaah brought him together [to his original form] and addressed Him, his reply was, "O my Lord, I feared You!" Or a wording similar to it. So he forgave him, and therefore, this act arose from this person unintentionally.

Similar to him is the person who was overcome by joy and took hold of his camel [which he had lost] and said, "O Allaah, You are my servant and I am your Lord", a statement of kufr. However, this person did not become a disbeliever on account of it, because he was overwhelmed and was overcome (by something he could not repel). On account of the severity of his joy he erred. He actually intended to say, "O Allaah, You are my Lord and I am Your servant", but he said, "O Allaah, You are my servant and I am your Lord".

The one who is compelled is compelled to kufr, so he says a statement of kufr or does an act of kufr, but he does not become a disbeliever from any textual [evidence] from the Qur'aan because he did not intend this act and did not choose it.

So we know that these rulers judge by what the Qur'aan gives evidence to – on the basis of the various differences within the madhhabs – in the personal matters such as nikah (marriage), faraa'id (inheritance) and what is similar to them. As for judging between people, then they differ. They also have a misconception which is put in front of them by some of the evil scholars who say, "The Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) says, 'You are more knowledgeable of the affairs of your worldly life' ", and that this is a general statement such that everything that brings about benefit in the worldly life then we have the freedom to choose and adopt it, because the Messenger said, "You are more knowledgeable of the affairs of your worldly life"!!

There is no doubt that this is a misconception. However does this allow them to avoid the laws of Islaam in applying the hudood (prescribed punishments) or preventing the consumption of intoxicants and what is similar to these things? It would have been more incumbent for them to have a misconception regarding some economical aspects [of rule], but as for this [matter] then there is no misconception regarding it at all.

As for completing [the discussion of] this doubt that has been cast down [concerning rebelling against the ruler], then it can be said regarding it: Allaah, after having made fighting obligatory, said: "O Prophet (Muhammad)! Urge the believers to fight. If there are twenty steadfast persons amongst you, they will overcome two hundred, and if there be a hundred steadfast persons they will overcome a thousand of those who disbelieve, because they (the

disbelievers) are people who do not understand.” (Anfaal 8:65). So how many are they?! One to ten. Then He said:

“Now Allâh has lightened your (task), for He knows that there is weakness in you. So if there are of you a hundred steadfast persons, they shall overcome two hundred, and if there are a thousand of you, they shall overcome two thousand with the Leave of Allâh. And Allâh is with As-Sâbirin (the patient ones, etc.).” (Anfaal 8:66)

And some of the scholars have said: “That was in the time of weakness, **and the ruling always revolves around its cause and basis**, therefore after Allaah made it incumbent upon them to have the patience of ten men... Further to this, we say: We have certain clear and decisive texts which explain this matter and which make it abundantly clear. Amongst them is His, the Most High’s saying: “Allâh burdens not a person beyond his scope.” (Baqarah 2:286)

So Allaah, free is He from all imperfections, does not burden a soul with more than it can bear and what it has power over. Allaah, free is He from all imperfections, also says: “So keep your duty to Allâh and fear Him as much as you are able.” (Taghaabun 64:16)

So if we declared that the aforementioned rebellion against this ruler was obligatory, **then [despite this] it would not be obligatory upon us while we are not able to remove him**. Therefore the matter is clear, but it is desire (hawaa) that makes a person relapse and stumble.” (From Fitnah of Takfir, originally from the cassette “Commentary upon Fitnah of Takfir” by Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen; also in Kaifa Nu’aaliju Waaqi’unaa al-Aleem, of Abu Lawz).

And indeed, after the affairs are made clear by the Ulamaa of Ahl us-Sunnah, it is only hawaa (desire) that makes the Qutubiyyah, Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah and those poisoned by their way of thinking, stumble and wander in every direction!

Doubt 2: Seeking as evidence the various rebellions that took place in history

Imaam al-Albaani was asked about the following doubt: “Some people used as evidence what occurred in Islamic history, such as the occurrence (of rebellion and fighting) in the fitnah of Ibn al-Ash’at (one of the Kharijites), and also the rebellion of many of the Reciters (of the Qur’aan), at the head of them, Sa’eed Ibn Jubair and whoever was with him. And likewise what happened from Aa’ishah (radiallaahu anhaa) and Zubair and Talhah, between them and Alee (radiallaahu anhu). So they say all of this happened and all of this was counted as rebellion and although they did not attain their actual objective, this rebellion is actually from those things that are permissible.

So is this argument by way of those occurrences which happened in the first times correct? And what is the answer? This matter is the cause of inciting many for the purpose of justifying the matter of khurooj (rebellion)”.

And Imaam al-Albaani replied, “Khurooj (rebellion) is not allowed. And these evidences that they have used are actually against the one who uses them. There is a wisdom that is

narrated from Isaa (alaihis-salaam), and its authenticity does not concern us as much as the correctness of its meaning. So it is related that he admonished his Disciples one day and informed them that there would be a Prophet who would be the Seal of the Prophets, and that there will be many false prophets after him. So they said to him “How shall we distinguish between the truthful from the liar?” And he replied by speaking with this wisdom alluded to earlier, which is his saying “By their fruits you shall know them”.

So this khurooj and that khurooj (i.e. from those previously mentioned), and amongst them is the khurooj of Aa'ishah (radiallaahu anhu), we judge this khurooj by its fruits. So were the fruits of the khurooj sweet or bitter? There is not doubt that Islamic history which has informed us about this or that khurooj makes it clear that it was evil. For the blood of the Muslims was shed, and went to waste, without any benefit being attained. Especially in what relates to the khurooj of Sayyidah Aa'ishah (radiallaahu anhaa), for she was remorseful for having made khurooj, and she used to cry severely such that her khimaar would become soaking, and would wish that she had no embarked upon that khurooj.

Hence, seeking evidence by way of these rebellions: Firstly: It is a proof against them, because there was no benefit in these rebellions

Secondly: Why do we stick to the khurooj of Sa'eed bin Jubair, but we do not stick to the absence of khurooj of the most major and senior of the Companions who were contemporary to him, such as Ibn 'Umar and others. Then the Scholars of the Salaf followed after him, and all of them saw the absence of khurooj against the ruler.

Hence, there are two types of rebellion: a) a rebellion in thought and ideology (al-khurooj al-fikri) and this is the most dangerous and b) a physical khurooj, which actually results from the first one (i.e. the ideological one).

Hence, this type of khurooj is not permissible, and the evidences you have used are actually against them, not for them.” (Cassette: “When is Khurooj Against the Ruler Allowed?”; and also in pp.94-95 of Kaifa Nu'aaliju Waaqi'unaa al-Aleem, of Abu Lawz).

Doubt 3: The Khurooj of Hussain bin Alee (radiallaahu anhu).

Shaikh Ibn Jibreen was asked, “It is said in the aqeedah of Ahl us-Sunnah: “And we do not rebel against a ruler”. So how do you explain these words in light of Hussain bin Alee's (radiallaahu anhu) act of rebelling against one of the Amawi Khaleefahs?”

The Shaikh replied, “Firstly: that Hussain (radiallaahu anhu) erred in this rebellion of his, and subsequently there occurred what occurred of his killing and the killing of those with him.

Secondly: He had not given the pledge of allegiance to the Khaleefah, who was Yazeed bin Mu'aawiyah. And it is well-known that Yazeed was shameless, and he was disobedient, and would drinking khamr (intoxicants, alcohol). He would also do actions, which led to

Hussain and Ibn az-Zubair and many of those from Makkah, to not give him the pledge of allegiance.

Thirdly: That the people of 'Iraq who had written to Hussain requesting his arrival there so that they can give the pledge of allegiance to him as a Khaleefah, they too had not given the pledge of allegiance to Yazeed. So they claimed that they would give the pledge of allegiance to Hussain, so that he can be the Khaleefah, and that when he resides with them, they will support and strengthen him. However, they did not fulfil all of this for when the army that was responsible for his death, actually assaulted him, they abandoned him." (Majmoo Fataawaa wa Rasaa'il Ibn Jibreel. Section on Aqeedah. Vol. 8; and quoted in Kaifa Nu'aaliju Waaqi'unaa al-Aleem, of Abu Lawz, p.96).

So it is clear that the Qutubiyyah, Kharijites and Diseased Partisans – despite the clear texts from Allaah's Messenger forbidding rebellion, unless clear kufr is observed, and despite the vast majority of the Companions, the Taab'ieen and all of the Salaf after them abandoning this khurooj (rebellion), they continue to use shubuhaat in order to lead the people to the destruction of their worldly affairs, and continue to use the practice of a few – which is opposed by the majority – in order to argue for its permissibility

Imaam Ash-Shaatibee said, in reference to those matters that are only acted upon by a few companions but not by the majority: "So those others (who opposed and did not act upon it) - then (their action) is the followed Sunnah and the much-frequented path, and as for that which was not acted upon save a little, then it is obligatory to verify (its correctness) and the correctness of conforming to it - whilst persisting and remaining upon what is more well-known (i.e. not to act upon it - as the majority of the Companions did not do so). For verily, the persistence of the majority (of the Companions) in opposing the few - either it is due to a Sharee'ah reason or other than Sharee'ah reason. And it is false for it to be other than a Shar'eeah reason - in fact it is not possible but for it to be a Sharee'ah reason. And when the affair is like this then [the one] acting so as to conform to the minority is like an adversary or opposer to that understanding for which the majority investigated the action - to check that it agrees [with such an understanding]. So it is necessary to investigate what they investigated and to agree with what they persisted upon" (Muwaafaqaat 3/57)

And indeed, upon investigating the Sunnah and sayings of the Companions and the books of aqeedah of the Salaf, we find consensus that khurooj against the tyrannical ruler (rebellion) is forbidden. And as for when there is clear kufr observed, then that is subject to the resultant harms and benefits, and does not warrant automatic khurooj. Further, almost every single khurooj in the whole of Islamic history, did not actually achieve what it was supposed to achieve, which is why the Salaf showed severe rejection and aversion from khurooj and contending with the authorities, and this is also alluded by both Ibn al-Qayyim and also Abdul-Lateef bin Abdur-Rahmaan bin Hasan Aal Shaikh in what has been quoted from them previously in this series.